

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CARLOS AMAY BAR,

Plaintiff,

— against —

MARLY BUILDING SUPPLY CORP., KIM KUM MA,
TOMMIE SUI, and U-C RENOVATOIN INC.,

Defendants.

19-CV-1187 (ARR)

Opinion & Order

**Not for electronic or print
publication**

ROSS, United States District Judge:

This Court has received the Report and Recommendation on the instant case dated August 1, 2023, from the Honorable Peggy Kuo, United States Magistrate Judge. No objections have been filed. The Court reviews “de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see also* *Brissett v. Manhattan & Bronx Surface Transit Operating Auth.*, No. 09-CV-874 (CBA)(LB), 2011 WL 1930682, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. May 19, 2011), *aff’d*, 472 F. App’x 73 (2d Cir. 2012) (summary order). Where no timely objections have been filed, “the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” *Finley v. Trans Union, Experian, Equifax*, No. 17-CV-0371 (LDH)(LB), 2017 WL 4838764, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2017) (quoting *Estate of Ellington ex rel. Ellington v. Harbrew Imports Ltd.*, 812 F. Supp. 2d 186, 189 (E.D.N.Y. 2011)). Having reviewed the record, I find no clear error. I therefore adopt the Report and Recommendation, in its entirety, as the opinion of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion to enforce the settlement agreement is denied.

SO ORDERED.

_____/s/_____
Allyne R. Ross
United States District Judge

Dated: September 21, 2023
Brooklyn, New York